

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/941,519	08	3/29/2001	William R. Wheeler	10559-605001 / P12889	01 / P12889 6850	
20985	7590	06/16/2005		EXAMINER		
FISH & RIC		•	THOMPSON, ANNETTE M			
12390 EL CA SAN DIEGO				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
				2825	-	
				DATE MAILED: 06/16/2009	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				111			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/941,519	WHEELER ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		A. M. Thompson	2825	_			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
THE - External after of the control	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOn ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a poperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thin tiod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	8 March 2005.	·				
2a)□		This action is non-final.					
3)□		wance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits is				
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1,3,4,16,17,38-40 and 42-49 is/are 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) 44-49 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 38-40 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 16,17,42 and 43 is/are objected to Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on 09/22/2002 is/are: a	a) accepted or b) object	ed to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	rection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have beer reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stage				
Attachmer	• •						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
3) Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB er No(s)/Mail Date		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2825

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection on 12/08/2004. Applicant's submission filed on 12/08/2004 was entered and considered. New grounds of rejection based on Applicants' amendment were entered in the action of 03/11/2005. However, the action should have been a Non-Final action. Accordingly, the finality of the last Office action of 03/11/2005 is hereby withdrawn, sua sponte, and the Amendment in Reply to Action of March 11, 2005 has been entered.

2. Applicants' Amendment has been considered and remarks reviewed. Claims 1, 38, 42, and 44 are amended. Claims 15 and 41 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 16, 17, 38-40, and 42-49 are pending.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because the drawing orientation of Figure 3 is inconsistent with that of Figure 2. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary

Art Unit: 2825

to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 38-40

1. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawman et al. (Lawman), U.S. Patent 5,673,198 in view of Applicants' admitted prior art and further in view of Watkins et al., U.S. Patent 5,220,512. Lawman discloses a concurrent electronic circuit design and implementation using a display system but fails to specifically disclose the elements of the group of integrated circuit components. Additionally, although Lawman discloses monitoring a design environment to detect design changes, Lawman fails to specifically disclose monitoring a design environment to detect the deletion of a circuitry component. Applicants' admitted prior art in the specification background (page 1, line 5-10) discloses the components of an integrated circuit. Because Lawman illustrates at least

Art Unit: 2825

a latch and 2 NAND gates in Figure 1, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention that Lawman at least suggests the inclusion of the integrated circuit components disclosed in Applicants' admitted prior art. Watkins discloses an electronic CAD system comprising, inter alia, a display screen and system. Watkins further details the design changes monitored by the electronic Cad display system (col. 5, II. 35-44) as including creating, selecting, moving, modifying, and deleting objects on the display screen. It therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to combine Lawman with Watkins for a more detailed understanding of the display design changes contemplated by Lawman since both Lawman and Watkins utilize Electronic CAD display systems as design tools.

2. Pursuant to claim 1, Lawman discloses a method of designing a semiconductor device (see Abstract), the method comprising: providing a plurality of component design parameter files in a data repository (Fig. 1, #20), each of the component design parameter files associated with a discrete circuitry component and including an estimated silicon area required to construct the discrete component (col. 2, II. 27-35 references occupied area), the circuitry components including at least some components selected from the group consisting of an AND gate, an OR gate, a NAND gate, a NOR gate, an XOR gate, a latch, and a flip-flop; maintaining a circuit design parameter file (Applicants' admitted prior art in specification, page 1, lines 5-10; see also Lawman Figure 1 design window elements) for a circuit being designed (col. 2, II. 19-29), the circuit design parameter file specifying an estimated total silicon area for the

Art Unit: 2825

circuit being designed (col. 2, II. 19-39); monitoring a design environment to detect an addition of a circuitry component to the circuit (col. 2, II. 41-56; see also col. 6, II. 5-55); accessing a component design parameter file associated with the determined type of circuitry component that specifies the estimated silicon area required to construct the added circuitry component; (col. 2, II. 19-39); updating the circuit design parameter file wherein updating includes adding the specified estimated silicon area required to construct the added circuitry component to the estimated total silicon area maintained in the circuit design parameter file so that the estimated total silicon area includes the silicon area required to construct the added circuitry component; and (col. 6, II. 5-25); providing the circuit designer with feedback concerning the estimated total silicon area required to construct the added circuitry component. (col. 6, II. 5-25 and II. 56-65); providing the circuit designer with feedback concerning the estimated total silicon area of the circuit being designed (col. 2, II. 35-40; col. 2, II. 49-56; col. 3, II. 5-21; col. 3, II. 24-32; col. 3, II. 58-65; col. 9, II. 15-29); and monitoring a design environment to detect the deletion of a circuitry component from the circuit being designed (Watkins, col. 5, II. 35-40; col. 6, II. 33-40).

- 3. Pursuant to claim 3, further comprising allowing the circuit designer to request feedback concerning the estimated total silicon area of the circuit being designed (col. 6, II. 50-55).
- 4. Pursuant to claim 4 wherein the designer is provided with feedback concerning the estimated total silicon area of the circuit being designed in response to the circuit

designer requesting feedback (col. 2, II. 35-40; col. 2, II. 49-56; col. 3, II. 5-21; col. 3, II. 24-32; col. 3, II. 58-65; col. 9, II. 15-29).

5. Pursuant to claims 38, 39 and 40, it comprises the limitations of claim 1, 3 and 4, respectively, but recites number of gates instead of estimated silicon area. Lawman discloses this limitation at column 9, lines 15-29, wherein it proposes an implementation process that "crosses a threshold in terms of number of gates" and further suggests that the expert system and design library would be applicable to an embodiment utilizing feedback with "number of gates".

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 16, 17, 42, 43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. Claims 44-49 are allowed.
- 8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Pursuant to claims 16, 17, 42 and 43, the prior art does not teach or suggest monitoring a design environment to detect the deletion of a circuitry component from the circuitry being designed in conjunction with providing the circuit designer with feedback concerning the total silicon area of a deleted circuitry component and updating the design parameter file considering the total silicon area for the deleted component. Pursuant to claims 44-49, in Applicants' method of designing a semiconductor device, the prior art does not teach or suggest providing feedback to a circuit designer regarding the number of transistors required to construct the circuit.

Art Unit: 2825

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to 9.

applicant's disclosure. Please reference the PTO-892 for a complete listing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be 10.

directed to Examiner A.M. Thompson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1909. The

Examiner can usually be reached Monday thru Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m..

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Status information for Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

11. Responses to this action should be mailed to the appropriate mail stop:

Mail Stop

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for all **OFFICIAL** communications intended for entry)

THOMPSON Primary Examiner

Technology Center 2800